**Africa RISING: Science Advisory Group Discussion Summary   
(Arusha, Tanzania, 23rd June 2017)**

|  |
| --- |
| **SAG members**   * + Moses Tenywa, Makerere University, Uganda   + Colettah Chitsike, Zimbabwe (apologies for absence)   + Jim Ellis-Jones, UK (elected Chair)   + Eva Weltzien-Rattunde, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA   + Nancy McCarthy, LEAD Analytics, Inc. USA   + Brigitte Maass, Georg-August-University Göttingen, Germany |

**Purpose of SAG:** The SAG has been set up by the Program to ensure continuous, high-quality science in Africa RISING. The group advises the Program Coordination Team (PCT) and has a major role in priority setting, helps establish strategic partnerships and external linkages to ensure that the technical program is well aligned and that the needed set of partners participates to achieve the goals and objectives of the Program.

**SAG-ToR:** Generally agreed, but SAG cannot participate in internal reviews as part of the present ToR. These would need to be agreed separately.

**Immediate priorities were seen as harmonization, scaling and lesson learning.**

1. **Moving from Phase 1 to Phase 2**
2. To help the SAG come up to speed and facilitate participation, SAG members felt that it was imperative that Africa RISING should synthesize the technologies that have been tested and validated in Phase 1 by country, as well as overall results with recommendations from Phase 1 research.
3. In addition, the SAG believes that it would be desirable to map Phase 2 projects and research activities onto the Theory of Change (ToC) and to organize reporting of Phase 2 activities by that mapping.
4. Looking forward, in addition to providing a coherent framework for reporting, organizing reports, using a ToC is now relatively standard practice and thus, what internal and external reviewers would expect to see. This would also make it easier to understand how regional projects’ indicators fit the ToC . And, once “sustainable intensification indicators are agreed, they can be included into ToC outcomes.

**In addition to the above points, the SAG discussed the following:**

1. **Learning/dissemination activities**: It would be instructive for the SAG to have greater clarification on the learning/dissemination activities that form a part of the communication strategies, and capacity building – and the link between communication and capacity building – particularly as these pertain to scaling.
2. **Platforms**: Building on point 2, the SAG is interested to understand better the strategies underlying the partnerships for scaling, and the role of the platforms in this strategy. Specifically:
   1. What are the mechanisms to reach “up” to the higher-level policy frameworks, as needed to enable scaling up
   2. Functioning of platforms at district level – it would be helpful to clarify their roles in scaling and also for the broader, landscape-scale activities
   3. If platforms are not functional in all counties, is there a substitute?
   4. If platforms are working well, what are plans to make sure the “right” partners for scaling join, and actively participate in, the platform
   5. Is there a need for lower-level (e.g. community-based) platforms
   6. Is there any accompanying research on the functioning and performance of the platforms?
   7. Are there any monitoring indicators for platform performance?
3. **Partnerships**:
4. It would be instructive to know, as Phase 2 evolves, which partnerships have been established at which level (see M&E below), clarifying the different roles for the partners
   * 1. The above can also help clarify the partners “involvement”, as stated in the phase 2 proposal. For instance, does this involvement include learning/sharing experiences, and learning across countries.
     2. Clarification of the roles of partners specifically in scaling, and linking stakeholders to achieve scaling
5. The above may be particularly helpful for identifying gaps, and comparing partnerships across the countries can be useful for determining how those gaps might be filled.
6. **Research Focus**:
7. Here, the main point of discussion for SAG members was to better understand the mechanisms for how requests for backstopping will be operationalized
8. Clarify how the typologies can be used and communicated in the 2nd Phase, specifically in the context of scaling.
9. SAG members are still unclear what exactly will fall under “generic” research and what will be considered backstopping (in part because the SAG remains unclear regarding the feedback mechanisms for identifying backstopping research, as discussed above).
10. **Monitoring and Evaluation:**
11. Here, the SAG would like more clarity on M&E for supra-household level indicators and data collection, e.g. for performance of platforms, for documenting partnerships and partner scaling activities, for the landscape-level activities, etc.
12. **Research Management**, particularly as concerns SAG:
13. SAG members agreed that it would be particularly useful to attend Annual Learning Meetings
14. The Phase 2 proposal discusses the role of chief scientists in ensuring harmonization and integration – this is one area where at least some direct communication between SAG and the chief scientists might be warranted. This might be as basic as sending SAG members any minutes of chief scientist meetings that concern harmonization and integration, for instance.
15. **Harmonization**:
16. Given the Terms of Reference for the SAG, harmonization is a key area for SAG involvement. Thus, the SAG would benefit from a discussion on the mechanisms for information flows to and from the SAG
17. **Data Management**:
18. Here, our discussion focused mainly on how data management (data collected for research, the M&E indicators, farmer typologies, etc) can be fully utilized for scaling.

**The Communities of Practice** (as discussed before the suggested re-organization by the management committee)

**CoP Primary SAG Secondary SAG**

Livestock Brigitte Maass Colletah Chitsike

Private Sector Moses Tenywa Eva Weltzien

Nutrition Eva Weltzien Brigitte Maass

Scaling Nancy McCarthy Jim Ellis-Jones

Socio-Economics1 Jim Ellis-Jones Nancy McCarthy

Watershed managment2 Moses Tenya

1 Now cuts across all CoPs, 2 Additional CoP

**Geographic Areas of Primary Expertise**

Jim Ellis-Jones East and Southern Africa, Ethiopia, West Africa,

Eva Weltzien West Africa

Moses Tenywa Tanzania, Ethiopia

Brigitte Maass Tanzania, Ethiopia

Colletah Chitsike Zambia, Malawi

Nancy McCarthy Zambia, Malawi

Minutes by Nancy McCarthy